



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,882	02/09/2004	Kevin Kwong-Tai Chung	AI-TECH-16B	8813
110	7590	05/10/2006	EXAMINER	
DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL & SKILLMAN 1601 MARKET STREET SUITE 2400 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-2307				DINH, TUAN T
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2841	

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/774,882	CHUNG, KEVIN KWONG-TAI	
	Examiner Tuan T. Dinh	Art Unit 2841	
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>			
<b>Period for Reply</b>			
<b>A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</li> </ul>			
<b>Status</b>			
<p>1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 August 2005</u>.</p> <p>2a)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is <b>FINAL</b>.                            2b)<input type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</p>			
<b>Disposition of Claims</b>			
<p>4)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the application.</p> <p>4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>17-20</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.</p> <p>5)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>4-6,9-16,22 and 23</u> is/are allowed.</p> <p>6)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-3,7,8 and 21</u> is/are rejected.</p> <p>7)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.</p> <p>8)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</p>			
<b>Application Papers</b>			
<p>9)<input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p>10)<input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)<input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b)<input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).</p> <p>11)<input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.</p>			
<b>Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119</b>			
<p>12)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</p> <p>a)<input type="checkbox"/> All    b)<input type="checkbox"/> Some * c)<input type="checkbox"/> None of:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">1.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">2.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">3.<input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</p>			
<p>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</p>			
<b>Attachment(s)</b>			
<p>1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.</p>		<p>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p>	

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (U.S. Patent 6,265,782) in view of Bernier et al. (U.S. Patent 5,847,929), and further in view of Hodges (U.S. Patent 5,337,179).

As to claims 1-2, Yamamoto et al. discloses a molecularly flexible dielectric electronic substrate (4, column 20, line 49) as shown in figures 1-3, 5, and 7A-7F comprising:

at least one layer of molecularly flexible dielectric adhesive (1-figures 1 and 5, column 20, lines 29-31 or 3-figures 2-3, and 7, column 20, line 50) having a modulus of elasticity less than about 500,000 psi (the modulus is measured at -50°C to 300°C, see column 14, lines 27-45), having a glass transition temperature less than about 0°C (the heat resistant thermoplastic film having Tg of -10°C or above, see column 4, line 66 through column 5, line 42), and having the ability to withstand soldering at a temperature of about 220°C (see column 5, line 56 through column 6, line 15);

a metal foil (9-figure 5, column 21, line 4) on one surface (a bottom surface of the adhesive 1-figure 5) of said layer of molecularly flexible dielectric adhesive (1-figure 5),

wherein said metal foil (9) is patterned to define a pattern of electrical conductors having a plurality of contact sites (solder balls formed into through holes and connected to the wiring 9).

Yamamoto et al. does not disclose the contact cites of the metal foil for receiving contacts of an electronic device.

Bernier et al. teaches a module assembly (250) as shown in figure 5 comprising a flexible substrate (256) having a plurality of contact cites (pads formed at a bottom of the substrate) connected to contacts (282) of an electronic device (280), see column 8, lines 50-62, column 9, lines 20-25.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have contact cites of a metal foil for receiving contacts of an electronic device as taught by Bernier et al., employed in the substrate of Yamamoto et al. in order to provide a level interconnection structure to form an enclosure electronic/semiconductor packaging.

Yamamoto et al. and Bernier et al. do not disclose the flexible substrate having a modulus of elasticity less than about 500,000 psi.

Hodges teaches a flexible substrate (22) as shown in figures 2-4 having a modulus of elasticity less than about 500,000 psi, see column 2, lines 65-66, column 5, line 43 through column 6, line 68.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a teaching of Hodges employed in the substrate of

Yamamoto and Bernier et al. in order to provide a controllable surface applied on a substrate when under high pressure.

As to claim 3, Yamamoto et al. does not disclose the electronic device having a plurality of contacts soldered to corresponding one of the contacts sites of the patterned metal foil on said molecularly flexible dielectric adhesive layer.

Bernier et al. teach the electronic device (280) as shown in figure 5 having a plurality of pads (282) soldered (259, 284) to corresponding the contact cites (the pads 260) of the substrate (256).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a device having a plurality of contacts soldered to the contact cites of a metal foil of the substrate as taught by Bernier et al., employed in the substrate of Yamamoto et al. in order to provide a better conductivity and bonding structure.

As to claims 7-8, Yamamoto et al. discloses said molecularly flexible dielectric adhesive has a modulus of elasticity less than about 100,000 psi or less than about 20,000 psi (see column 14, lines 27-36, and also, the attached paper attaching with the conversion between Mpa to psi).

3. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. ('782) in view of Bernier et al. ('929) and Hodges ('179), and further in view of Brodsky et al. (U.S. Patent 5,984,691).

As to claim 21, Yamamoto et al. Bernier et al., and Hodges do not disclose a plated electrically conductive layer on at least the contact sites of said metal foil.

Brodsky et al. shows a flexible substrate (50) as shown in figure 1 comprising a plated through hole (63, column 6, lines 50-51) on at least a contact site of a metal foil (56).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a plated electrically conductive layer on at least the contact sites of said metal foil as taught by Brodsky et al. employed the substrate of Yamamoto et al. and Bernier et al. in order to provide an interconnection between interlayer of a substrate.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 4-6, 9-16, and 22-23 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the references cited disclose a molecularly flexible dielectric substrate comprising: a first layer of molecularly flexible dielectric adhesive, first and second metal foils defined pattern of first and second electrical conductors, and some other claimed elements. However, they do not disclose or render obvious in combination of the substrate having a protective enclosure sounding the electronic device having attached at least along its periphery to the molecularly flexible dielectric adhesive layer (as recited in claim 4), and an underfill adhesive bonding the electronic device and said molecularly flexible dielectric adhesive layer (as recited in claim 5), a plurality of electrically conductive vias

through the first layer of molecularly flexible dielectric adhesive, the plurality of electrically conductive vias being in a pattern for providing electrical connection between ones of the first electrical conductors and ones of said second electrical conductors (as recited in claim 9).

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan T. Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-1929. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kammie Cuneo can be reached on 571-272-1957. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Tuan Dinh  
October 26, 2005.